

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****OCT 27 2006**

Applicants : Brent J. Bos, Kenneth Schofield, Mark L. Larson and Niall R. Lynam
Serial No. : 10/823,323
Page : 12

Remarks:

The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action dated June 27, 2006. The period for response is extended to October 27 via the enclosed petition and fee for a one month extension of time. This response is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination to withdraw the finality of the previous rejection.

Claims 103-147 are pending in the application. Independent claims 103, 134 and 147 have been amended as set forth above. The amendments are fully supported in the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

ALLOWED CLAIMS

Claims 127 and 128 are allowed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 103-105, 107-120, 125, 126, 129 and 135-146 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bechtel et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,451,822 ("Bechtel '822"), in view of Noack, U.S. Patent No. 4,355,271 ("Noack"), and in view of Vachss, U.S. Patent No. 5,313,072 ("Vachss"). Claim 106 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bechtel '822, Noack and Vachss combination, in further view of Bendicks et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,498,866. Claims 121-124 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bechtel '822, Noack and Vachss combination, in further view of Shiraishi, U.S. Patent No. 4,881,019. Claim 130 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bechtel '822, Noack and Vachss combination, in further view of Kobayashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,426,294. Claim 131 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bechtel '822, Noack and Vachss combination, in further view of Kiyomoto et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,844,682. Claim 132 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

Applicants : Brent J. Bos, Kenneth Schofield, Mark L. Larson and Niall R. Lynam
Serial No. : 10/823,323
Page : 13

unpatentable over the Bechtel '822, Noack and Vachss combination, in further view of Levers, U.S. Patent No. 5,276,389. Claim 133 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bechtel '822, Noack and Vachss combination, in further view of Teder, U.S. Patent No. 5,568,027. Independent claim 147 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bechtel '822, in view of Vachss, and in further view of Stam et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,837,994 ("Stam '994").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants have amended independent claim 103 to clarify that the control is operable to process the outputs with at least one of a filtering process, an edge detection function and a detection control function. The control is operable to control at least one of (a) a windshield wiper of the vehicle and (b) a defogging system of the vehicle responsive to the processing. Applicants have amended independent claim 134 to clarify that the control is operable to process the first output with at least one of a filtering process, an edge detection function and a detection control function, and the control is operable to control a windshield wiper of the vehicle responsive to the processing of the first output from the first imaging array. Applicants have amended independent claim 147 to clarify that the control is operable to process the first output with at least one of a filtering process, an edge detection function and a detection control function, and the control is operable to control a windshield wiper of the vehicle responsive to the processing of the first output from the first imaging array.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Bechtel '822, Noack and Vachss does not disclose, teach, suggest or render obvious the interior rearview mirror system of the present invention, particularly as set forth in independent claims 103 and 134 and in the claims depending therefrom. Nor does the combination of Bechtel '822, Vachss and Stam '994 disclose, teach, suggest or render obvious the interior rearview mirror system of the present invention, particularly as set forth in independent claim 147.

Applicants : Brent J. Bos, Kenneth Schofield, Mark L. Larson and Niall R. Lynam
Serial No. : 10/823,323
Page : 14

Bechtel '822 discloses a control system that controls an electrochromic rearview mirror and that energizes and deenergizes the vehicle headlamps in response to the sensed ambient and glare light levels, which are sensed by light sensors. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Bechtel '822 of, for example, an imaging sensor that generates outputs indicative of sensed images, nor is there any disclosure or suggestion in Bechtel '822 of, for example, a control that is responsive to outputs of an imaging sensor, and of a control that is operable, for example, to process the outputs with at least one of a filtering process, an edge detection function and a detection control function, and that is operable to control at least one of (a) a windshield wiper of the vehicle and (b) a defogging system of the vehicle responsive to the processing. With respect to the rejection of independent claim 134, Bechtel '822 does not, for example, disclose or suggest the use of two imaging arrays, with the control being responsive to processing of the output of one imaging array as described above for controlling a windshield wiper of the vehicle, and the control being responsive to the output of the other imaging array to control a headlamp of the vehicle.

Noack discloses a control apparatus that controls a windscreen wiper apparatus of a vehicle in response to variations in infra-red radiation incident on a detector at the windscreen. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Noack of, for example, an imaging sensor that generates outputs indicative of sensed images, nor is there any disclosure or suggestion in Noack of, for example, a control that responsive to outputs of an imaging sensor, and of a control that is operable, for example, to process the outputs with at least one of a filtering process, an edge detection function and a detection control function, and that is operable to control at least one of (a) a windshield wiper of the vehicle and (b) a defogging system of the vehicle responsive to the processing. Nor does Noack disclose or suggest two imaging arrays such as set forth in independent claim 134 and the claims depending therefrom. To the contrary, the detector of Noack is an infrared sensor that detects light emitted by an emitter device.

Applicants : Brent J. Bos, Kenneth Schofield, Mark L. Larson and Niall R. Lynam
Serial No. : 10/823,323
Page : 15

Vachss discloses an optical detector for windshield wiper control that controls the windshield wipers of a vehicle in response to a detector array. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Vachss to control any other function of the vehicle. Nor is there any disclosure or suggestion in Vachss of, for example, an imaging sensor or imaging array that generates outputs indicative of sensed images, and/or of, for example, a control that responsive to outputs of an imaging sensor, and/or of a control that is operable, for example, to process the outputs with at least one of a filtering process, an edge detection function and a detection control function, and that is operable to control at least one of (a) a windshield wiper of the vehicle and (b) a defogging system of the vehicle responsive to the processing. Nor does Vachss disclose or suggest two imaging arrays such as set forth in independent claim 134. To the contrary, the detector array of Vachss detects light that is from a light source and scattered at the windshield, and determines the light intensity as a function of the distance from the optical axis.

Thus, with respect to the rejection of independent claims 103 and 134, Applicants submit that there is no disclosure or suggestion of the claimed invention in Bechtel '822, Noack and/or Vachss and/or the combination thereof, and there is no suggestion or motivation in the references to combine the teachings of the references. Further, even if such a combination is made, the combination does not result in the claimed invention of claims 103-126 and 129-146 of the present application.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 147, Applicants submit that the combination of Bechtel '822, Vachss and Stam '994 does not disclose, teach, suggest or render obvious the claimed invention of claim 147. Stam '994 discloses a headlamp control. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Stam of, for example, a control that is operable, for example, to process outputs of an imaging sensor with at least one of a filtering process, an edge detection function and a detection control function, and that is operable to control at least one of (a) a windshield wiper of the vehicle and (b) a defogging system of the vehicle responsive to the processing. Therefore, Applicants submit that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Bechtel '822, Vachss and Stam '994 of the claimed invention, and there is no suggestion or motivation in the

Applicants : Brent J. Bos, Kenneth Schofield, Mark L. Larson and Niall R. Lynam
Serial No. : 10/823,323
Page : 16

references to combine the teachings of the references. Further, even if such a combination is made, the combination does not result in the claimed invention of claim 147.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Bechtel '822, Noack, Vachss and/or Stam '994, either alone or in combination with one another or with any other prior art of record, do not disclose, teach, suggest or render obvious the interior rearview mirror system of the present invention, particularly as set forth in independent claims 103, 134 and 147 and in the claims depending therefrom. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 103-126 and 129-147 is respectfully requested.


Claims 103-147 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 103-147 are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly and respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BRENT J. BOS ET AL.

By: Van Dyke, Gardner, Linn & Burkhardt, LLP

Date: October 27, 2006.



Timothy A. Flory
Registration No. 42 540
2851 Charlevoix Drive, S.E., Suite 207
P.O. Box 888695
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49588-8695
(616) 975-5500

DON01 P-1149
TAF:ell